

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/787,064	CAIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael P Colaianne	1731	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael P Colaianne. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Robert Carlson. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 16 July 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,4-6 and 13-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claim 1 was amended to correct a minor informality and make the claim read better. Claims 4-6 and 14-15 were cancelled because they are directed to a second embodiment of the invention that uses a two burner assembly. The independent claims 1 and 11 were amended to an embodiment that uses a single burner assembly. Thus, claims 4-6 and 14-15 were improperly dependent. Claim 13 was amended to correct its dependency. Claim 13 was depending from claim 12, which was cancelled in this amendment.